

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-11, 13-16 and 18-21 are pending in the present application. Claim 22 has been newly added. Applicant respectfully responds to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 2, 4-5, 7-11, 13-16 and 18-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahn et al. (US Patent No. 6,681,111) found in co-pending application 10/077,556, in view of Marin et al. (US Patent No. 6,298,232).

Additionally, the Office Action rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being allegedly unpatentable over Ahn et al. (US Patent No. 6,681,111) found in co-pending application 10/077,556, in view of Marin et al. (US Patent No. 6,298,232) further in view of Hronek (U.S. Patent No. 6,564,055).

The Office has the burden under 35 U.S.C. § 103 to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. *In re Piasecki*, 745 F.2d 1468, 1471-72, 223 USPQ 785, 787 (Fed. Cir. 1984). To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, the prior art references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Second, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Third, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). See MPEP § 2143 - § 2143.03 for decisions pertinent to each of these criteria.

Claimed Elements are Not Taught by the Prior Art**Claims 1, 10, 15 and 21**

Independent claims 1, 10, 15 and 21 recite, *inter alia*, a GGG being configured to support communication between a first network and a second network to enable a mobile station (MS) subscribed in the first network to communicate using the second network, ... a logic unit

configured to execute program logic to obtain authentication information from the first network based on the identity of the mobile station, to store the authentication information for subsequent accesses by the mobile station, and further configured to determine whether authentication parameters from the mobile station satisfy GGG authentication criteria. Thus, in the present application, an exemplary embodiment according to independent claims 1, 10, 15, and 21 includes a General Global Gateway (GGG) which internetworks between the first and the second networks. Mobile stations of a first network, such as a GSM network, support a GSM signaling protocol and a GSM authentication procedure. Mobile stations of the second network, such as a CDMA network, support a CDMA signaling protocol and a CDMA authentication procedure (paragraph [0028]). The GGG receives a location message from a mobile station and uses an identifier in the location message to obtain authentication information to know which HLR/AuC it needs to interrogate (paragraph [0031]). Furthermore, the GGG stores the first network's authentication parameters for subsequent accesses by the mobile station. Thus, the entire authentication procedure may not need execution on a subsequent access, which means the first network's core may not need accessing (paragraph [0065]). A check is made to determine whether the authentication parameters continue to meet GGG authentication criteria. (paragraph [0068]).

Ahn reference

The Office Action relies on Ahn as teaching *the GGG being configured to support communications between a first network and a second network and on enabling the mobile station subscribed in the first network to communicate using the second network*. Specifically, the Office Action states that Ahn (title, abstract, Col. 2, lines 36-46, Col. 3, lines 62-65, Col. 4, lines 17-33, Col. 5, lines 28-46, Col. 6, lines 32-54, and Col. 12, lines 39-57) discloses “a general global gateway configured to support communications between a first network and a second network (see GSM and CDMA figure 1) to enable a mobile station subscribed in the first network to communicate using the second network.”

Ahn teaches a system comprising a CDMA terminal with a GSM SIM card installed within it to provide roaming access to a GSM service subscriber in the CDMA service area. Ahn does not contemplate using the CDMA network for these purposes. In Ahn, the

information on the GSM service subscribers is stored on the SIM, connected to a controller, which transmits the data to the GSM service subscriber via the SIM interface and a CDMA burst channel. (Col. 4, lines 32-50). There is no teaching in Ahn of a GGG that obtains authentication information from the first network based on the identity of the mobile station, stores the authentication information for subsequent accesses by the mobile station and determines whether authentication parameters from the mobile station satisfy GGG authentication criteria as claimed. Although Ahn is directed to a roaming gateway (IRGS) that connects the GSM (or first) and CDMA (or second) networks, the IRGS performs only functions of a visitor location register (VLR) for the GSM (or first) network and a home location register (HLR) for the CDMA (or second) network. (Col. 6, line 62 to Col. 6, line 3). Applicants submit that, in fact, the CDMA terminal in Ahn communicates via the GSM SIM card, and not via the CDMA (or second) network, and therefore teaches away from the GGG having such characteristics. Specifically, the reference teaches: "The CDMA terminal that accommodates the GSM SIM card requires additional functions for transmitting and receiving data required by the GSM system...One of the additional functions is ...to deliver data to the GSM system that is in need for user authentication when registering the location of a roaming subscriber" (Col. 6, lines 4-11). Thus, Ahn fails to teach either a GGG configured to support communication between a GSM (or first) network and CDMA (or second) network to enable a mobile station (MS) subscribed in the GSM (or first) network to communicate using the CDMA (or second) network or that the GGG obtains authentication information from the first network based on the identity of the mobile station, stores the authentication information for subsequent accesses by the mobile station and determines whether authentication parameters from the mobile station satisfy GGG authentication criteria.

Moreover, when authentication of the GSM service subscriber is required, transmission and receiving of authentication data in Ahn is performed via a CDMA data burst message transmission, and this function is also performed by the CDMA terminal, and not by a GGG (Col. 6, lines 8-14). By contrast, the authentication function in the claimed invention is performed by the logic unit of the GGG.

Marin

The Office Action relies on Marin as teaching *storing authentication information for subsequent accesses by the mobile station*. Specifically, the Office Action states Marin (Figs. 3-5 and 11, Col. 4, lines 6-49) discloses an interworking function (IWF) which has a database for subscribers who are roaming in networks, other than their home network.

Marin is directed to a system that allows voice message notifications to be received while a mobile subscriber to a first network, which operates according to a first protocol, roaming in a second network, which operates according to a second protocol (Col. 2, lines 58-63). An interworking function (IWF) is used to convert the protocols to allow voice message notifications to be received by a subscriber to the first network while the subscriber is roaming in the second network and vice versa. (Col. 4, lines 1-5). In order to implement the IWF, a database is built for the subscribers who are roaming in networks, other than their home network. The database contains the mobile subscriber's number in the home network, the subscriber number assigned to the mobile subscriber by the visited network and data which is used in the translation of the voice message notification. By retrieving the record from the IWF database, the IWF has all of the information which is necessary for translation of the signaling messages between both networks.

A database is a structured collection of records or data that is stored in a computer system and is *not a general global gateway* that can store authentication information for subsequent accesses by the mobile station as claimed. The global gateway of the claimed invention is used to authenticate information by determining if certain criteria have been met and *not merely for storing information as in Marin*. Citing a reference for a system which provides voice message notifications for roaming mobile devices in different networks that includes a database does not teach the claimed subject matter. Consequently, the cited prior art fails to teach the limitations as claimed.

Since Ahn and Marin each fail to teach or suggest the invention as claimed in independent claims 1, 10, 15 and 21, any combination of these references also fail to teach the elements of the above claims.

No Motivation to Combine Cited References

Assuming, *arguendo*, that every claimed element is taught by the prior art, Applicant further submits that there is no motivation to combine Ahn and Marin as alleged in the Office Action.

The Office has the burden to show that one of ordinary skill in the art could have combined the elements claimed by known methods, and that in combination, each element would have merely performed the same function as it did separately. "In determining the propriety of the Patent Office case for obviousness in the first instance, it is necessary to ascertain whether or not the reference teachings would appear to be sufficient for one of ordinary skill in the relevant art having the reference before him to make the proposed substitution, combination, or other modification." *In re Linter*, 458 F.2d 1013, 1016, 173 USPQ 560, 562 (CCPA 1972).

Even if the references were combined, albeit improperly in Applicant's opinion, as described above, Applicants submit that the combination of the references does not teach or suggest the general global gateway of independent claims 1, 10, 15 and 21.

The Office Action states that "it would have been obvious ...to incorporate the exemplary database as taught by Marin into the teachings of Ahn in order to allow the locations of mobile stations to be properly tracked as they move from one network to another thus making it easier to provide voice message notifications to roaming subscribers as taught by Marin."

No independent reason has been provided whereby the teachings of Marin would be combined with those of Ahn to provide a general global gateway as claimed. Even if both prior art references Marin and Ahn may separately teach the claimed elements, there is no objective reason why a person of ordinary skill in the art would choose to combine the claimed elements (a general global gateway configured to support communication between a first network and a second network to enable a mobile station subscribed in the first network to communicate using the second network and where the GGG obtains authentication information from the first network based on the identity of the mobile station, stores the authentication information for subsequent accesses by the mobile station and determines whether authentication parameters from the mobile station satisfy GGG authentication criteria) from among all possible other combinations. That is, even if all claimed elements are taught by Marin and Ahn, barring

reliance on the Applicant's claims, there is no objective reason found in the cited prior art why such different systems (e.g., a general global gateway that authenticates information by determining if certain criteria have been met and a system which provides voice message notifications for roaming mobile devices in different networks that includes a database used to track roaming subscribers but not to determine if certain criteria have been met for authentication purposes) would be combined.

In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action has not set forth the *prima facie* case of obviousness. Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action has not supplied evidence of the necessary motivation needed to lead one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Marin and Ahn. Accordingly, absent such motivation, a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has not been established and the rejection must be withdrawn.

To establish obviousness based on a combination of elements disclosed in the prior art, there must be some motivation, suggestion, or teaching of the desirability of making the specific combination that was made by the Applicants. The motivation suggestion or teaching may come explicitly from one of the following: (a) the statements in the prior art (patents themselves); (b) the knowledge of one of ordinary skill art, or in some cases; and (c) the nature of the problem to be solved. See Dembiczak 50 USPQ at 1614 (Fed.Cir. 1999).

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the Office Action must provide particular findings as to why the two pieces of prior art are combinable. See Dembiczak 50 USPQ2d at 1617. Broad conclusory statements standing alone are not "evidence". The alleged motivation for combining Marin and Ahn to reject the claims asserted by the Office Action is: "to allow the locations of mobile stations to be properly tracked as they move from one network to another thus making it easier to provide voice message notifications to roaming subscribers." Such alleged motivation is not present in any of the references and has merely been alleged by the Office Action.

Combining prior art references without evidence of such a suggestion, teaching, or motivation simply takes the inventor's disclosure as a blueprint for piecing together the prior art to defeat patentability--the essence of hindsight. Dembiczak, 50 USPQ2d at 1617. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are allowable for at least this additional reason.

Furthermore, the Office Action has not provided the requisite evidence to support its allegation that there is motivation to combine Marin and Ahn, so as to render obvious.

The Office Action must explain the reasons why one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to select the references and to combine them to render the claimed invention obvious (In re Fritch, 972 F.2d 1260, 1265, 23 USPQ2d 1780, 1783 (Fed. Cir. 1992) the Office Action can satisfy the burden of showing obviousness of the combination "only by showing some objective teaching in the prior art or that knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art would lead that individual to combine the relevant teachings of the references"). Thus, the Office Action has not adequately provided a proper combination of Marin and Ahn to render the claims obvious. Relying on common knowledge or common sense of a person of ordinary skill in the art without any specific hint or suggestion of this in a particular reference is not a proper standard for reaching the conclusion of obviousness. See In re Sang Lee, 61 USPQ 2d 1430 (Fed. Cir 2002). Further, relying on obvious design choice as a reason for combining teachings of the various references is again not the proper standard for obviousness.

Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill would not be motivated by the teachings of Marin to modify Ahn to develop the GGG configured to support communication between a GSM network and a CDMA network as claimed in independent claims 1, 10, 15 and 21.

No Reasonable Expectation of Success

Even if the references were combined, albeit improperly in Applicant's opinion, as described above, Applicant submits that the combination of the references does not teach or suggest the general global gateway as claimed.

Combining Marin and Ahn does not involve a simple combination of features but would require a wholesale redesign or restructuring of the general global gateway taught by Ahn. Consequently, there is no reasonable expectation of success in combining these two references.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action has failed to set forth a *prima facie* case of obviousness as to the claimed invention in independent claims 1, 10, 15 and 21.

Claim 6

As to dependent claim 6, the Office Action cites Hronek, Marin and Ahn as allegedly substantially teaching the claimed invention except for “the service center is configured to send and receive Internet Protocol messages to and from the second network.”

Claimed Elements are Not Taught by the Prior Art

The Office has the burden to show that the prior art included each claimed element. As discussed above, Ahn and Marin fail to teach or disclose all of the limitations of the claimed invention.

The Office Action, on Page 9, relies on Hronek for making up for this deficiency of Ahn and Marin. The Office Action cites Hronek (Col. 10, lines 35-46 and Col. 13 lines 31-40) as teaching “the service center is configured to send and receive Internet Protocol messages to and from the second network.” However, a careful review of Hronek reveals that Hronek is merely directed to a system and method of updating carrier information in a roaming mobile device that is less burdensome on a wireless network than conventional apparatus and methods. (Col. 3, lines 34-37) Although the cited section (col. 10, lines 35-46) in the Office Action references communicating using TCP/IP protocol over the Internet, this refers communications of the HLR 820, the mobile activity status tracker (MAST) 400, and/or the location based Internet Roaming Database (IRDB) manager 100 of different wireless carriers, *not different networks*. Nowhere does Hronek disclose that *the service center is configured to send and receive Internet Protocol messages to and from the second network*.

Consequently, the cited prior art, either alone or in combination, fails to teach the limitations as claimed.

No Motivation to Combine Cited References

Assuming, *arguendo*, that every claimed element is taught by the prior art, Applicant further submits that there is no motivation to combine Ahn, Marin and Hronek as alleged in the Office Action.

The Office has the burden to show that one of ordinary skill in the art could have combined the elements claimed by known methods, and that in combination, each element would

have merely performed the same function as it did separately. "In determining the propriety of the Patent Office case for obviousness in the first instance, it is necessary to ascertain whether or not the reference teachings would appear to be sufficient for one of ordinary skill in the relevant art having the reference before him to make the proposed substitution, combination, or other modification." *In re Linter*, 458 F.2d 1013, 1016, 173 USPQ 560, 562 (CCPA 1972).

Even if the references were combined, albeit improperly in Applicant's opinion, as described above, Applicants submit that the combination of the references does not teach or suggest the general global gateway of dependent claim 6.

The Office Action states that "it would have been obvious ...to utilize the teachings of Hronek into the teaching of Ahn and Marin in order to provide MS services when they roam into a new region, as well as, saving MS user money by offering the least expensive service plan to the MS user."

No independent reason has been provided whereby the teachings of Hronek would be combined with those of Ahn and Marin to provide a general global gateway as claimed. Even if the prior art references Ahn, Marin and Hronek may separately teach the claimed elements, there is no objective reason why a person of ordinary skill in the art would choose to combine the claimed elements (a general global gateway configured to support communication between a first network and a second network to enable a mobile station subscribed in the first network to communicate using the second network and where the GGG obtains authentication information from the first network based on the identity of the mobile station, stores the authentication information for subsequent accesses by the mobile station and determines whether authentication parameters from the mobile station satisfy GGG authentication criteria and *where the service center is configured to send and receive Internet Protocol messages to and from the second network*) from among all possible other combinations. That is, even if all claimed elements are taught by Ahn, Marin and Hronek, barring reliance on the Applicant's claims, there is no objective reason found in the cited prior art why such different systems (e.g., a general global gateway that authenticates information by determining if certain criteria have been met and a system which provides voice message notifications for roaming mobile devices in different networks that includes a database used to track roaming subscribers but not to determine if certain criteria have been met for authentication purposes) would be combined.

In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action has not set forth the prima facie case of obviousness. Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action has not supplied evidence of the necessary motivation needed to lead one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Ahn, Marin and Hronek. Accordingly, absent such motivation, a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has not been established and the rejection must be withdrawn.

To establish obviousness based on a combination of elements disclosed in the prior art, there must be some motivation, suggestion, or teaching of the desirability of making the specific combination that was made by the Applicants. The motivation suggestion or teaching may come explicitly from one of the following: (a) the statements in the prior art (patents themselves); (b) the knowledge of one of ordinary skill art, or in some cases; and (c) the nature of the problem to be solved. See Dembiczak 50 USPQ at 1614 (Fed.Cir. 1999).

In order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the Office Action must provide particular findings as to why the two pieces of prior art are combinable. See Dembiczak 50 USPQ2d at 1617. Broad conclusory statements standing alone are not "evidence". The alleged motivation for combining Hronek with Marin and Ahn to reject the claims asserted by the Office Action is: "to provide MS services when they roam into a new region, as well as, saving MS use money by offering the least expensive service plan to the MS user." Such alleged motivation is not present in any of the references and has merely been alleged by the Office Action.

Combining prior art references without evidence of such a suggestion, teaching, or motivation simply takes the inventor's disclosure as a blueprint for piecing together the prior art to defeat patentability--the essence of hindsight. Dembiczak, 50 USPQ2d at 1617. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are allowable for at least this additional reason. Furthermore, the Office Action has not provided the requisite evidence to support its allegation that there is motivation to combine Hronek with Marin and Ahn, so as to render obvious.

The Office Action must explain the reasons why one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to select the references and to combine them to render the claimed invention obvious (In re Fritch, 972 F.2d 1260, 1265, 23 USPQ2d 1780, 1783 (Fed. Cir. 1992) the Office Action can satisfy the burden of showing obviousness of the combination "only by

showing some objective teaching in the prior art or that knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art would lead that individual to combine the relevant teachings of the references"). Thus, the Office Action has not adequately provided a proper combination of Hronek with Marin and Ahn to render the claims obvious. Relying on common knowledge or common sense of a person of ordinary skill in the art without any specific hint or suggestion of this in a particular reference is not a proper standard for reaching the conclusion of obviousness. See *In re Sang Lee*, 61 USPQ 2d 1430 (Fed. Cir 2002). Further, relying on obvious design choice as a reason for combining teachings of the various references is again not the proper standard for obviousness.

Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill would not be motivated by the teachings of Hronek to modify Marin and Ahn to develop the GGG configured to support communication between a GSM network and a CDMA network as claimed in dependent claim 6.

No Reasonable Expectation of Success

Even if the references were combined, albeit improperly in Applicant's opinion, as described above, Applicant submits that the combination of the references does not teach or suggest the general global gateway as claimed.

Combining Hronek, Marin and Ahn does not involve a simple combination of features but would require a wholesale redesign or restructuring of the general global gateway taught by Ahn. Consequently, there is no reasonable expectation of success in combining these two references.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action has failed to set forth a *prima facie* case of obviousness as to the claimed invention in dependent claim 6.

Claim 8

As to dependent claim 8, the Office Action cites Marin and Ahn as allegedly substantially teaching the claimed invention except for "the messages deliver services that are provided by the first network that may not be provided by the second network."

Claimed Elements are Not Taught by the Prior Art

The Office has the burden to show that the prior art included each claimed element. As discussed above, Ahn fails to teach or disclose all of the limitations of the claimed invention.

The Office Action, on Page 5, relies on Marin for making up for this deficiency of Ahn. The Office Action cites Marin (Col. 2, lines 54-63, Col. 2 line 64 – Col. 3 line 25 and Col. 4, lines 6-49) as teaching “the messages deliver services that are provided by the first network that may not be provided by the second network.” However, a careful review of the sections of Marin cited by the Office Action reveal that Marin is merely describing that two networks have different signaling protocols and that different actions may be performed on the IWF database. Nowhere does Marin disclose that *messages deliver services that are provided by the first network that may not be provided by the second network*.

Consequently, the cited prior art, either alone or in combination, fails to teach the limitations as claimed.

No Motivation to Combine Cited References

Assuming, *arguendo*, that every claimed element is taught by the prior art, Applicant further submits that there is no motivation to combine Ahn and Marin as alleged in the Office Action.

The Office has the burden to show that one of ordinary skill in the art could have combined the elements claimed by known methods, and that in combination, each element would have merely performed the same function as it did separately. "In determining the propriety of the Patent Office case for obviousness in the first instance, it is necessary to ascertain whether or not the reference teachings would appear to be sufficient for one of ordinary skill in the relevant art having the reference before him to make the proposed substitution, combination, or other modification." *In re Linter*, 458 F.2d 1013, 1016, 173 USPQ 560, 562 (CCPA 1972).

Even if the references were combined, albeit improperly in Applicant's opinion, as described above, Applicants submit that the combination of the references does not teach or suggest the general global gateway dependent claim 8.

The Office Action states that “Marin teaches the messages deliver services that are provided by the first network that may not be provided by the second network (col. 2, lines 54-63, col. 2 line 64 – col. 3 line 25, col. 4, lines 6-49).” No reason has been provided whereby the

teachings of Marin would be combined with those of Ahn to provide a general global gateway as claimed. Even if both prior art references Marin and Ahn may separately teach the claimed elements, there is no objective reason why a person of ordinary skill in the art would choose to combine the claimed elements (a general global gateway configured to support communication between a first network and a second network to enable a mobile station subscribed in the first network to communicate using the second network and where the GGG obtains authentication information from the first network based on the identity of the mobile station, stores the authentication information for subsequent accesses by the mobile station and determines whether authentication parameters from the mobile station satisfy GGG authentication criteria and *where the messages deliver services that are provided by the first network that may not be provided by the second network*) from among all possible other combinations. That is, even if all claimed elements are taught by Marin and Ahn, barring reliance on the Applicant's claims, there is no objective reason found in the cited prior art why such different systems (e.g., a general global gateway that authenticates information by determining if certain criteria have been met and a system which provides voice message notifications for roaming mobile devices in different networks that includes a database used to track roaming subscribers but not to determine if certain criteria have been met for authentication purposes) would be combined.

In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action has not set forth the prima facie case of obviousness. Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action has not supplied evidence of the necessary motivation needed to lead one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Marin and Ahn. Accordingly, absent such motivation, a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has not been established and the rejection must be withdrawn.

To establish obviousness based on a combination of elements disclosed in the prior art, there must be some motivation, suggestion, or teaching of the desirability of making the specific combination that was made by the Applicants. The motivation suggestion or teaching may come explicitly from one of the following: (a) the statements in the prior art (patents themselves); (b) the knowledge of one of ordinary skill art, or in some cases; and (c) the nature of the problem to be solved. See Dembiczak 50 USPQ at 1614 (Fed.Cir. 1999).

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the Office Action must provide particular findings as to why the two pieces of prior art are combinable. See Dembiczak 50 USPQ2d at 1617. Broad conclusory statements standing alone are not "evidence". In this case, no statement or findings have been provided as to why the references may be combined.

Combining prior art references without evidence of such a suggestion, teaching, or motivation simply takes the inventor's disclosure as a blueprint for piecing together the prior art to defeat patentability--the essence of hindsight. Dembiczak, 50 USPQ2d at 1617. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are allowable for at least this additional reason. Furthermore, the Office Action has not provided the requisite evidence to support its allegation that there is motivation to combine Marin and Ahn, so as to render obvious.

The Office Action must explain the reasons why one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to select the references and to combine them to render the claimed invention obvious (In re Fritch, 972 F.2d 1260, 1265, 23 USPQ2d 1780, 1783 (Fed. Cir. 1992) the Office Action can satisfy the burden of showing obviousness of the combination "only by showing some objective teaching in the prior art or that knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art would lead that individual to combine the relevant teachings of the references"). Thus, the Office Action has not adequately provided a proper combination of Marin and Ahn to render the claims obvious. Relying on common knowledge or common sense of a person of ordinary skill in the art without any specific hint or suggestion of this in a particular reference is not a proper standard for reaching the conclusion of obviousness. See In re Sang Lee, 61 USPQ 2d 1430 (Fed. Cir 2002). Further, relying on obvious design choice as a reason for combining teachings of the various references is again not the proper standard for obviousness.

Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill would not be motivated by the teachings of Marin to modify Ahn to develop the GGG configured to support communication between a GSM network and a CDMA network as claimed in dependent claim 8.

No Reasonable Expectation of Success

Even if the references were combined, albeit improperly in Applicant's opinion, as described above, Applicant submits that the combination of the references does not teach or suggest the general global gateway as claimed.

Combining Marin and Ahn does not involve a simple combination of features but would require a wholesale redesign or restructuring of the general global gateway taught by Ahn. Consequently, there is no reasonable expectation of success in combining these two references.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action has failed to set forth a *prima facie* case of obviousness as to the claimed invention in dependent claim 8.

Claims 2, 4, 7, 9, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19 and 20

As to dependent claims 2, 4, 7, 9, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19 and 20 the Office Action also cites Ahn as teaching the recited limitations. While Applicant disagrees the cited prior art teaches the limitations recited in these claims, this argument need not be reached since these dependent claims are in condition for allowance due to their dependence on independent claims 1, 10 and 15.

Additionally, Applicant has added new independent claim 22 having substantially the same scope of independent claims 10, 15 and 21. Applicant believes the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and an early allowance are respectfully requested.

Applicant has reviewed the references made of record and asserts that the pending claims are patentable over the references made of record.

In view of the above, therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of, and/or objection and allowance of claims 1-21.

Should any of the above rejections be maintained, Applicant respectfully requests that the noted limitations be identified in the cited references with sufficient specificity to allow Applicant to evaluate the merits of such rejections. In particular, rather than generally citing whole sections or columns, Applicant requests that the each claimed element be specifically identified in the prior art to permit evaluating the references.

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026. Applicant hereby petitions a two (2) month Extension of Time to be charged to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated February 28, 2008
:

By: /Won Tae C. Kim/

**Won Tae C. Kim, Reg. # 40,457
(858) 651 6295**

QUALCOMM Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502